



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

HM

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,847	11/10/2001	Michael Yeung	66329/14869	1898
23380	7590	03/07/2005	EXAMINER	
TUCKER, ELLIS & WEST LLP 1150 HUNTINGTON BUILDING 925 EUCLID AVENUE CLEVELAND, OH 44115-1475			NGUYEN, TRONG NHAN P	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2152		

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/052,847	YEUNG ET AL.
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jack P Nguyen	2152

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

### **Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2001.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                    2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/4/02

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-32 are being examined.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 1-4 and 9-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kumashio, 6,782,387 (Kumashio hereafter).**

As per claim 1, Kumashio teaches a method of providing access to a network-based document management system from a client (abstract), comprising the steps of: defining access point data representative of an access point within a local file system of the client (col. 13, lines 52-58; client (c3, fig. 3) can view through its access point its own local file system); interfacing to said access point with a local file navigation interface (col. 13, lines 52-58; client (c3, fig. 3), via its local access point, has a file navigation interface (T1, fig. 3) that allow it to access files from within its local file system as well as other servers' data systems as shown in fig. 4); and accessing the network-based document management system from within the local file navigation interface via said

access point defined within said local file system (col. 13, lines 52-65; fig. 4 shows a user, via its access point from its local interface, can access other document servers' file systems).

Claims 12, 18, and 27 recite similar limitations to claim 1; therefore, they are rejected using similar rationale as claim 1.

As per claims 2, 13, 19, and 28, Kumashio teaches a user of said local file navigation interface in the step of interfacing transfers document files between said local file system and the network-based document management system via said access point (col. 13, lines 41-43 & 52-58; col. 14, lines 47-56; client (c3, fig. 3) can access data server (c1, fig. 3) via its interface program (p1, fig. 3); using its interface to other data servers, client can manipulate or transfer documents between itself to any of the data servers as shown in fig. 4).

As per claims 3, 14, 20 and 29, Kumashio teaches a user-selectable folder icon that conforms to a user interface of an operating system of said client (F1, figure 4, col. 14, lines 45-47; user can select any folder to access from its user interface).

As per claim 4, Kumashio discloses local file navigation interface is integrated into an operating system of said client (fig. 4, col. 14, lines 4-20).

As per claims 9 and 24, Kumashio teaches access point in the step of defining provides a link between said local file system and the network-based document management system (col. 14, lines 35-44; fig. 4 shows an interface linking the client and data servers file systems).

As per claims 10 and 25, Kumashio teaches a user who accesses the network-based document management system via said access point in the step of accessing performs deleting, renaming, moving and copying a document file (fig. 18c, col. 19, lines 37-40; user can manipulate the document file using any of these commands).

As per claims 11 and 26, Kumashio teaches a user who accesses the network-based document management system via said access point in the step of accessing performs transferring a folder between said local file system and the network-based document management system (col. 13, lines 41-43 & 52-58; col. 14, lines 47-56; client (c3, fig. 3) can access the data server (c1, fig. 3) using its interface program (p1, fig. 3); using its interface to the data server's access point, client can manipulate or transfer folders between itself to any of the data servers as shown in fig. 4).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumashio in view of Huang et al, 6,571,245 (Huang hereafter).**

As per claims 5-8, while Kumashio does not explicitly show security measures such as validating the user when the user logs into his workstation or the network prior

to granting access to document management system or when the user accesses the access point via his local file navigation interface, it is well known in the art that various security parameters such as valid userIDs and passwords are widely employed to restrict unauthorized access to private data as shown by Huang in [element 410, fig. 4, col. 13-15]. Huang further discloses a user can select various levels of security parameters as desired (col. 14, lines 58-63) such as restricting access to certain file folders (col. 9, lines 45-48). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary in the art to use security parameters to restrict unauthorized access to private data systems and files.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Wanderski, 6,147,687; Leonardos, 6,778,972; Gasser, 6,636,250; Lamping et al, 6,370,538; Ferguson et al, 6,810,404; Ferguson et al, 6,820,094; Kukura et al, 6,633,923

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack P Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3945. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jpn



Dung C. Dinh  
Primary Examiner  
Primary Examiner